



**Steering Committee
Draft - Committee Meeting Summary**

October 23, 2001

The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.

Steering Committee Members Present:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peter Beaulieu
PSRC | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandra Meyer
City of Renton | <input type="checkbox"/> Jack Kennedy
U.S. Army Corps |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Leonard
FHWA | <input type="checkbox"/> Mick Monken
City of Woodinville | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bernard Van deKamp
City of Bellevue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian O'Sullivan
Sound Transit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill Barlow
Community Transit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leonard Newstrum
Yarrow Point |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jonathan Freedman
U.S. EPA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terra Hegy
WA Fish & Wildlife | <input type="checkbox"/> Don Cairns
City of Redmond |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Arndt
City of Kirkland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Johannes Kurz
Snohomish County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eddie Low
City of Bothell |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Brennan-Dubbs
U.S. Fish & Wildlife | <input type="checkbox"/> Ann Martin
King County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Witmer
FTA |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Drais
FTA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kim Becklund
City of Bellevue | <input type="checkbox"/> Seyed Safavian
City of Bothell |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mitch Wasserman
City of Clyde Hill | <input type="checkbox"/> Bob Sokol
City of Kenmore | <input type="checkbox"/> Don Wickstrom
City of Kent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bill Vlcek
City of Lynnwood | <input type="checkbox"/> Debra Symmonds
City of Mercer Island | <input type="checkbox"/> Kevin Gross
City of Newcastle |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Therese Swanson
WA Dept. of Ecology | <input type="checkbox"/> Sharon Griffin
Hunts Point | <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Morrow
City of Tukwila |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dan Burke
Port of Seattle | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Carr
PSCAA | <input type="checkbox"/> Barbara Gilliland
Sound Transit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chuck Chappell
FHWA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Craig Stone
WSDOT | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tom Gibbons
NMFS | <input type="checkbox"/> Allyson Brooks
WA Dept. CT&E | |

Staff and Observers

Project Management Team

Mike Cummings, WSDOT
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
Ron Anderson, DEA
Christina Martinez, WSDOT
Nytasha Sowers, WSDOT

Keith McGowan, McGowan Environmental
Paul Bergman, PRR
Fen Hsiao, PRR

CALL TO ORDER – PROGRAM UPDATE

Mr. Cummings started the meeting at 1:40 p.m. He went over the meeting focus:

- Update on Program Status and Schedule
- Preferred Alternative Recommendations Process
- Discussion and Draft Recommendations
- Go Diamondbacks!

Mr. Cummings advised the committee that they are not being asked to make a final PA decision today. He said the team is hoping the committee can clarify the elements of which they are in general agreement and the elements they need more information on.

Mr. Cummings gave a Schedule Update and advised Future Steering Committee Meetings.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the upcoming Fall Speakers Bureau schedule.

DEIS Update:

- DEIS issued August 17.
- Public Hearings held Sept. 18, 19 & 20.
- Comment period ends October 24.
- Received over 1600 emails, letters, cards, comment forms and public testimony to date.
- Comments can be reviewed on internal website.
- Public comment review meeting on October 30.

Mr. Cummings said comments are categorized and accessible through the program's internal website.

Public Comment Summary:

- 1,500 total pieces of communication through October 21, 2001 yielding over 650 individual comments.
 - 34 comment forms from open house
 - 1,016+ letters, including over 1,000 form-letter postcards (not fully tallied)
 - 366+ e-mails, including over 300 form-letter e-mails (not fully tallied)
 - 80 records of public testimony

Ms. Hegy asked what time the meeting on Oct. 30th was. Mr. Cummings said 11:30 a.m.

Ms. Hegy asked if the Executive Committee meeting prior to the All Committee Meeting would be at the same location. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Steering Committee Working Group Report:

September 10:

Clarification of roles of members; GMA compliance; Need for preferred Alternative based on environmental considerations

October 2:

Potential "Sticking Points" that need consideration

October 11:

Conditions that address "sticking points"

NOVEMBER 1 – Next meeting
Common themes (concerns & conditions)

Mr. Cummings asked Therese Swanson to give an update on the Steering Committee working group.

Ms. Swanson said there have been three meetings so far. She noted that Christina Martinez has taken notes at all three meetings. She said the purpose of the meetings is for local governments and agencies to talk about shared concerns and for information sharing.

Ms. Swanson said at the first meeting, the group developed a list of 23 different topics. The list has been passed out to all Steering Committee members. She said most of first meeting was spent getting to know each other.

The second meeting focused on getting to a PA. She said they talked about sticking points that may get in the way of a certain agency or city coming to a decision. No one has made hard rules on what conditions they can or can't accept. She said the committee still needs a lot of information and is having a difficult time coming up with firm conditions.

They also talked about the PA worksheets and reviewed them with Ms. Martinez. She said the sub-committee would like to help the whole Steering Committee come up with a PA. She said the group recognizes that everyone may not agree.

The next meeting will be on Nov. 1 at 1-4:30 p.m. Mr. Cummings encouraged members to attend.

Upcoming Public Outreach Activities:

Communicating the Decision

- Newsletter
- Citizen's Guide on Preferred Alternative
- Website
- Speaking Engagements
- Media Outreach

Mr. Cummings reviewed the PA Decision Process.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked when the meeting announcement would be issued. What happens when the committees do not concur? Mr. Cummings said if the committees cannot concur, they would have to go through a dispute resolution process.

Ms. Swanson asked if the PA would go into the FEIS, assuming there's a concurrence. Mr. Cummings said yes.

She asked if the PA will be the end product or if there is some other mechanism regarding the record of decision. She said it sounds like WSDOT or the program management team will have another decision point regarding the PA before the final decision is issued. Mr. Cummings said that according to the Reinventing NEPA Process, there's another consensus point for this group regarding the FEIS. Mr. Cummings said he assumes there'll be other decision points that will arise and influence what the final decision will be.

Ms. Swanson said according to the DEIS, the FEIS will analyze the Steering Committee's PA and then there will be another decision point. She said it doesn't make sense. Mr. Cummings said he understood her point and they would work on clarifying the process.

Mr. Kurz asked if more technical information would be issued before they make a PA decision. He said in several parts of the DEIS, there's mention that research is still being done on HOV and TDM. Mr. Cummings said they have continued to research as they decide their PA. He said he has a list of papers that were handed out today that are in draft form and that are available, but he didn't want to overload the committee. He said the papers are on specific topics. Mr. Cummings said the committee could do what they choose with them.

Mr. Cummings said the final PA decision is made by many different groups and organizations in addition to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Kurz asked when this would be taking place. Mr. Cummings said the recommendation will be submitted as soon as the environmental process is complete and before the record of decision.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked if the recommendation would include the record of decision. Mr. Cummings said it would be included in late spring or summer.

Mr. Cummings reviewed Concurrence Point 3:

- Formal written determination by agencies with jurisdiction that the project information is adequate for the current phase of the process. Concurrence means the project may proceed to the next phase without modification.
- Agencies agree not to revisit previous concurrences unless there is substantial new information, or substantial changes have been made to the project, the environment, laws and/or regulations.
- Agencies will have the option to comment on elements of the project at the appropriate points in the process. Concurrence does not mean a permit will be issued – just that the project information for the current phase is

Ms. Hegy said the language about "project" information being adequate doesn't make sense because the program is on a program and not project level. Mr. Cummings said they would rewrite it appropriately.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked what detail is included at the program level? She said she is concerned they will have difficulty concurring because of the level of detail. Mr. Cummings said they aren't asking for a permit. He said this doesn't mean they are willing to issue permits on all individual projects.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked if this limits the committees so they can't look at other alternatives. Mr. Cummings said the committees are agreeing on a generic idea.

Ms. Swanson asked, in regards to bullet 2, who will be judging if the material is "substantial."

Mr. Beaulieu suggested changing the wording in bullet one. He said the bullet should emphasize the "program" information. Mr. Cummings said this is Reinventing NEPA

wording. This is the language they are pulling out of a process they have agreed to follow. Mr. Cummings said they could put some changes in for this project.

Ms. Hegy asked if “project” basically means “program?”

Mr. Beaulieu said the program consists of different projects. He said the bullet point wording should be changed. Mr. Cummings said they would do something and come back to the committee with it later. However, he said he doesn't want to get into wordsmithing at this point.

Committee Recommendation process:

- Review draft PMT recommendations?
- Review/discuss committee worksheet responses
- Identify areas of emerging consensus and approve as draft recommendations
- Focus majority of time on elements that need more discussion
- Draft recommendations and outstanding issues; brief Executive Committee on Oct. 30th
- Discuss remaining issues and finalize recommendations at Nov. meeting.

Mr. Cummings said the PMT's recommendation is available if the committee wants it.

Ms. Swanson asked where the Draft PMT recommendation fits in with the rest of the recommendations. Mr. Cummings said the PMT recommendation was only shown to the Citizen and Steering committees when they developed the preliminary preferred alternative, but not to the Executive Committee. He said the PMT tried to go through the same exercises the committees go through when deciding their PA.

Mr. Cummings asked if the committee wants to PMT recommendation.

Ms. Hegy said she wants to discuss the worksheets first. Mr. Cummings said the PMT recommendations would be held until the committee requests them.

Mr. Bergman said the worksheet responses haven't been great, but everyone agreed to come to the meeting with theirs filled out, so that's good.

Ms. Swanson asked what the PMT used to arrive at their recommendation? Mr. Samdahl said they used the results of the EIS, the public hearings and input from the co-leads. He said the PMT did not take the worksheet responses into consideration.

Draft Conditions for Support:

- Maintain, protect and enhance the environment.
- Minimize construction impacts on mobility and communities.
- Meet local, state and federal design guidelines.
- Secure funding for inclusion in the MTP.
- Ensure community support through project level environmental review and public involvement.
- Phase projects so that transit and bottlenecks improvements are made first.
- Adaptive management.

Mr. Cummings said they need to develop a funding plan before it can go into the MTP. He said it's likely the project will happen in phases. They have been asked to review the first phase before going onto the next phase.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the major elements that most committee members have indicated should be included in the PA recommendation. He asked the members to let him know if any elements should be moved into the list requiring more discussion.

Emerging Consensus Elements:

- #1 TDM Package
- #2 Transit Expansion
- #3c HCT: BRT
- #3 HCT: Study Fixed Guideway in Central Area
- #4 Arterial HOV Priority
- #5 HOV Express on I-405 with Direct Access Ramps
- #6 Add Park and Ride Capacity to match demand
- #7 Add Transit Center Capacity to match demand
- #8 Basic I-405 improvements
- #12 Add Collector Distributor lanes on I-405 where needed
- #14 SR 167/405 interchange improvements
- #15 Improve connecting freeway capacity to I-405
- #16 Implement planned arterial improvements
- #17 Expand capacity on North-Sound Arterials
- #18 Upgrade connecting arterial connections to I-405
- #19 Corridor Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
- #20 Corridor ITS improvements
- #21 Corridor Freight Enhancements

Mr. Cummings said they don't have all the conditions, but they will in November when they see this list again. He asked the members to tell him if the list was generally in agreement with the conditions they thought necessary to make a PA. If not, the element will be put on a "Needs More Discussion" list.

Mr. Beaulieu asked if they are looking for comments on each component. Mr. Cummings said they would like to have discussions on components that members have many concerns with.

Mr. Beaulieu proposed that they have a position paper that responds to the myths listed in Mr. Newstrum's handout. He said they need dialogue on the questions in the handout.

Mr. Cummings asked if the committee generally feels comfortable with Element 1. They said yes.

Mr. Leonard asked if they could remove elements from the "Needing More Discussion" list if they no longer require it. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs said she would only agree with Element 3c if it doesn't include the addition of a new lane.

Mr. Beaulieu said BRT would be configured so it can be replaced with a higher form of technology in the future. He said the program should include a policy that ensures a facility will not just be torn out right after it's put in.

Mr. Bergman encouraged the members to mail in their worksheets with these comments or conditions so the PMT could have a record of them.

Mr. Cummings said some people's conditions might not be the same or ok to the conditions of others.

Mr. Barlow said they should first get through the list because they might discover that some issues are covered within others.

Mr. Kurz asked if they all agree with what "basic" means in Element 8. Mr. Cummings said a definition of this is in the workbook.

Ms. Swanson asked about Element 17. How can she not have an objection of the elements that are only included in Alternative 3 or 4? Mr. Samdahl said these happened to be analyzed in Alternative 3 or 4 but they may still be an issue if you're planning on voting for Alternative 2.

Mr. Cummings said the impacts have been evaluated in the DEIS.

Mr. Kurz said that for the PA, you could put it in Alternative 2.

Ms. Hegy said the difference between Element 16 and 17 is that one has added lanes. Mr. Cummings said they would have some capacity plans.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked how she could find the impacts of specific projects instead of the whole program. Mr. Cummings said the DEIS does not look at specific projects because of the level of analysis. He said he is able to get information on specific affects if she would like.

Mr. Newstrum said he voted yes for Element 19. He asked if the program would be considering long trails. Mr. Cummings said this committee previously voted yes on this.

Mr. Kurz asked if the long trails would be running along side of the highway. Mr. Cummings said no.

Committee members expressed consensus on the elements listed and then focused their discussion on the elements that needed more discussion before recommendations could be made.

Mr. Samdahl took over the meeting's lead to discuss Outstanding Elements.

Elements Needing More Discussion:

TDM-

Regional Pricing Options:

#1 - Do not support regional pricing

#2 - Actively support regional pricing

#3 - Identify interest in 'further study' beyond I-405 recommendation

- Support consideration of use-based pricing as a potential transportation management and/or financing tool in the I-405 corridor
- Examine various pricing scenarios
- Portions of I-405 Corridor Program could be candidates for future demonstration programs relating to value pricing...
- ...but only in the context of an established regional pricing policy

Mr. Kurz said regional pricing is such a broad term. He thinks they should agree to a commitment in the program to whatever PSRC comes up with for pricing. He said he thinks this should be included in the program.

Mr. Van deKamp said the managed lane piece encompasses a pricing question. He said he feels comfortable putting in a regular TDM package, but not an expanded one. He said this policy is beyond what they're trying to do. He said he's trying to get a better grasp on managed lanes and doesn't feel good putting forth an expanded managed lane piece.

Mr. Samdahl said they looked at what the PSRC pricing task force came up with. He said they are basically talking about applying pricing on a facility level or corridor level that would potentially lead into the managed lane idea. He said the slide is something the PMT put together.

Mr. Barlow said the whole thing comes down to whether they want to support regional pricing. He said they couldn't discuss it right now, in this forum.

Mr. Newstrum said they have to pass the ball to the region.

Mr. Samdahl said they aren't trying to reach a consensus now. They're just trying to make sure they have enough information.

Mr. Leonard said he thinks it's time to look at pricing.

Mr. Fordyce said he thinks the condition is that they should allow flexibility. He said they should allow for future dialog to look at it in the future.

Mr. Burke said there's a difference in the program saying they just haven't made a decision or stating that they have left it up to the region, which might imply they're just lazy and don't care.

Mr. Kurz said if they want the local government to buy into the program, there has to be more than regional pricing. He said they need clear examples of what it can entail. Mr. Cummings said they are not sure if they have a clear example. They only have the alternatives.

Mr. Davis said they have asked for a grant to do a demonstration that is not project or site specific. Many of them feel they aren't going to build a project until they have some sort of pricing. He said it's important to recognize this is an issue. He said it's unlikely they will raise enough taxes to build. He said he would like to get to pricing moving so they can get ready.

Mr. Samdahl said it seemed like his team is heavy on the financing. Mr. Davis said they need to keep it available as a pricing technique.

Mr. Bergman said there have been three variations of Element 3. Now that it's down to 3 options, the committee needs to figure out how to characterize it.

Mr. Kurz said they have to identify how the project will be financed when they take it to the public.

Mr. Bergman said they would come back with a statement written that would address their comments of support for pricing.

Mr. Cummings said they would marry Option 2 and 3. In Option 2, "actively" will be changed to "generally."

Lane Balance Issues:

- Current lanes are not balanced north/south in corridor
- With two added lanes along corridor, congestion remains in south end
- Additional study (s. of I-90) looked at:
 - a. +3 lanes
 - b. Auxiliary and truck-climbing lanes

Lane Balance Results in S. End:

- +3 lanes
- Diverts traffic to corridor
- Some congestion benefits
- High cost
- Auxiliary and truck-climbing lanes
- Focused investment at key locations
- Likely congestion benefits
- Preparing cost and property impacts

Regarding bullet 2, Mr. Beaulieu asked if people are trying to get over to I-90 or are they north bound? Mr. Samdahl said it's a mixture, but they didn't look at this in detail. He said they thought I-90 volumes would drop, but they didn't see that happening.

Mr. Kurz said the problem results partly from truck trips that have gone over to I-5 because the situation on I-405 is so bad that they prefer to work their way through Seattle instead. Now they've come back. Balance is not between lanes, it's between demand and number of lanes. He said SR 167 and I-90 put a lot of traffic into the corridor and if they had an alternative, there would be less congestion.

Mr. Newstrum asked if diversion would still result if they do improvements to I-405? They would still get traffic from SR 167 and I-90. Mr. Samdahl said there would still be a little, but diversion isn't always bad.

Ms. Becklund said south of I-90, they don't know what's required and they don't think they have a responsibility or want to make a decision on their own.

Ms. Becklund asked what Newcastle and Renton's take on it is. Mr. Afzali said he would like congestion benefits and cost. Their citizens are suspicious of the third lane.

Mr. Barlow said Mr. Anderson's lane balancing handout makes more sense. He said it's variable in different sections in the corridor.

Mr. Fordyce said of Element 10 in the worksheet - what if they change the wording to "up to" 2 lanes in each direction instead of adding 2 lanes and being concrete about it?

Mr. Barlow said they should get to the definition of where lanes are needed.

Mr. Samdahl showed slides of maps noting where the added lanes will be. He said if the program goes with the PPA, it makes the most sense to go with 2 lanes in the majority of the corridor. There are a few exceptions. Some places could be a certain number of lanes plus auxiliary lanes, etc. He said they should use the PPA as a catalyst for discussion.

Ms. Swanson said it makes sense that the lane additions will be fragmented and will differ along the corridor. However, she said she is still grappling with the extra pavement and the notion of 2 lanes in either direction. She said it's too much impervious surface and environmental impacts. Mitigation measures are still fuzzy and no one's agreed to it yet. She said she doesn't see the analysis and the alternatives aren't compared with each other in the DEIS. There is a need to evaluate the HCT option more because it includes much more impervious surfaces.

Ms. Becklund said she hadn't wanted to go to more than one GP lane in each direction. But then, as she got further into the research, she found that if they didn't add more than one GP lane, it started to squeeze congestion and traffic outside the urban growth area, creating more sprawl. She encouraged the committee to look at the analysis again.

Ms. Becklund said she doesn't want to expand arterials. She said it's largely regional traffic because drivers don't want to deal with I-405. She said there is more support for managed lanes from the Bellevue Council now. It makes sense from a performance standpoint. She said in terms of person trips, they would get more capacity using a mixed mode approach with GP lanes. She said HOV to HOV intersections are really good. However, Bellevue is not supporting pure HCT in Alternative 1 and 2 because it won't be as affective.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs said she has difficulties with the increased environmental impacts with all the alternatives compared to the existing baseline. She said especially the impacts to endangered species. She argued that no matter how many lanes the program puts in, it would have an impact.

Ms. Hegy asked if BRT is something they can put in now?

Ms. Becklund said they might need more ROW than what is on I-405. She said it could be within the corridor or within the study area but doesn't know if this could be included in the program. She said the lack of exclusivity for BRT is troubling.

Mr. Newstrum asked if they should reconsider saving the BNSF for further use and instead use it now. Mr. Samdahl said that's jumping ahead.

Mr. Van deKamp said that's not where the program is right now. He said after 2020, BRT would not be reliable. Bellevue wants additional ROW rather than substitution. By 2025 they will be looking at a more intensive HCT system.

Mr. Barlow said they would really make an environmental difference if they make an improvement with 2 lanes. If they only do one lane, they would just be widening the road and will not have the opportunity to do as much for the environment. Two lanes will actually make improvements rather than just making minimal improvements.

Mr. Beaulieu asked what “phasing” means. Mr. Anderson said it means the construction will be performed in segments.

Mr. Beaulieu asked if HOV to HOV intersections would come first. Mr. Cummings said it depends on how it’s funded and upon phasing decisions.

Ms. Becklund said she wasn’t necessarily suggesting phasing.

Mr. Anderson reviewed I-405 Capacity Options and maps detailing the options.

I-405 Capacity Options:

- #1 Support PPA (+2 lanes)
- #2 Support PPA with lane balancing
- #3 Support other alternatives

SR 167 Capacity

Issues:

- Logical transition point
- Wetland vs. Property Impacts
 - Stacked roadway possibilities

Options:

- #1 - Support PPA (up to 2 lanes added)
- #2 - Support 1 lane added
- #3 - Support no added lanes

Mr. Samdahl said the SR 167 issue has been a topic for conversation.

Ms. Hegy said that in terms of environmental retrofitting, she doesn’t know what difference the mitigation will be between adding one or two lanes. She said if they had a package that included all the mitigation necessary for adding two lanes, it might make the alternative look better.

Mr. Cummings said the committee has to decide what they want to see happen. No matter what the program does, there will be impacts. Even not doing anything will have impacts. He said the question is that given the fact there will be some impacts, what are the issues the committee wants addressed? What are the conditions for making improvements in the corridor?

Mr. Afzali said there has to be a balance. At the local level, you are dealing with regional issues. Regionally, benefits need to be given while local impacts need to be mitigated.

Mr. Van deKamp said they need to accommodate regional traffic. What is it going to take as far as environmental mitigation to make I-405 improvements? They’ve heard that adding any impervious surface make the environmental people nervous, but they see it as a necessary evil. He asked if the environmental agencies don’t like

the impervious surface because they haven't seen a mitigation package they like yet? Or are they saying they will deal with all the cumulative effects of not doing anything because they don't want more impervious surface? Mr. Van decamp said the issues are a consequence of growth. He asked if there is some way the agencies and the local jurisdictions could come together. He said that every meeting is the same discussion.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs said she hasn't brought up mitigation. Mitigation doesn't fully compensate for the impacts of impervious surfaces. Streams are already damaged and won't be fully mitigated. She said she does not necessarily want growth either. She said she just wants the most effective package that will meet both transportation and environmental needs.

Mr. Beaulieu said mitigation, retrofitting, and mitigation within the context of an entire basin as well as what off-site things can be done are the issues the committee should be considering. He argued that these issues need closure.

Mr. Samdahl said the committee needs to articulate the conditions under which any of the expansions might be acceptable.

Mr. Cummings took over the meeting's lead again to discuss the BNSF.

BNSF Background Update:

- Selling/sold strips of property and intends to maintain approximately 50 foot corridor
- Has long term interest in upgrading and/or relocating line perhaps in conjunction with WSDOT and high capacity transit providers

Mr. Cummings said they have received confirmation that the BNSF is being sold. Fundamentally, the BNSF wants to keep the line. However, they would consider running it along I-405. They are in deliberations about adding a third line to connect to the line over Stevens Pass via Everett. This potentially provides additional room for a Sounder extension and passenger rail. If they upgrade the existing line than they would like to run more freight on it than currently. However, they have environmental constraints and they don't have money to improve the ROW. Also, Mr. Cummings said the BNSF would like to get out of downtown Renton.

Mr. O'Sullivan said long-term preservation is ensured. However, they will lose adjacent properties that could be used as transit stations.

Mr. Barlow said if they keep the BNSF as a rail gauge there would not be much they can operate on it unless it is stacked. Mr. Cummings agreed.

Mr. Barlow asked if the BNSF could be brought into one piece of rail in sections? Mr. Cummings said yes, but it's getting difficult.

BNSF Options:

Preferred alternative (PA) options:

- –#1: Basic position (under any action alternative)
Seek to utilize BNSF right-of-way:
 - If adjacent to I-405 in order to avoid residential and business impacts
 - If offers environmental mitigation/enhancement

- #2: Not include in PA
 - 50' right of way would still be maintained
 - Opportunity to set up separate study to look at future joint use and upgrading opportunities
- #3: Include in PA
 - Seek to preserve property being sold for:
 - Core area future HCT uses
 - Balance for bike-pedestrian uses that support transit and other trip reduction opportunities.
 - Long trails, if part of recommendation
 - Bill suggested under include in PA – need line that describes how the 50 feet will be used and how HCT will be used.

Mr. Beaulieu requested documentation of the discussion with BNSF and who talked to whom. He said he needs a record. Mr. Cummings said he has emails. Mr. Beaulieu said he needs copies of the emails.

Mr. Cummings said if they acquire a third lane out of Seattle, they wouldn't have to run freight down the BNSF. He reiterated the fact that parts of the BNSF are being sold off.

Mr. Beaulieu said it's part of state rail plan. He said maybe the region should be looking at the third line so the eastside won't lose the preservation option of the BNSF.

Managed Lanes on I-405:

Questions:

- Manage up to two lanes each direction along I-405?
- Utilize pricing (tolls) as a management tool?

Mr. Cummings said they don't know all the problems with either issue yet. They don't have enough information to advise the committee if one idea is better than the other.

Managed Lane Analysis on I-405:

- Managed Express Lanes vs. HOV Lanes
 - HOV lanes getting full (need 3+)
 - Managed Lanes help balance vehicle and person demand along freeway
 - ML increases average person speeds
 - Capacity available for some non-HOV use of ML during peak periods
- Toll Option not yet evaluated

Mr. Barlow said managed lanes would only get balanced if GP were allowed into the lanes by pricing. Mr. Cummings said this may be correct but they don't know if the only way to do it is with access restrictions. He said they could potentially have variable access points. However, it has to be a bit wider in the locations where cars are moving in and out of the lanes. Mr. Cummings said managed lanes are a valuable tool and the key decision is whether or not to add the extra four feet.

Mr. Kurz said the main feature of an HOV lane is tolling and letting in SOVs for extra money. Mr. Cummings said the committee should try to make the decision in two parts: managed lanes and tolling.

Ms. Meyer asked if freight could be carried on managed lanes without tolls. Mr. Cummings said if the lanes look really attractive to freight, than they will always be in them.

Mr. Barlow said if they consider managed lanes, it changes a lot of other elements they've already agreed on. Mr. Cummings said not necessarily. He said they would also work out a lot of details in the project level.

Potential Managed Lane Conditions for I-405:

- Maximize person and vehicle throughput
- Encourages transit and HOV mode shares
- Maintains BRT speed and reliability
- Provides access to long distance freight
- Avoids diversion of traffic to arterials and neighborhood streets

Options for Managed Lanes:

- #1. Should we include managed lanes in PA?
 - Yes, subject to conditions and further study
 - No
- #2. If yes, should pricing (tolls) be part of the strategy?
 - Yes, subject to conditions and further study
 - No

Mr. Cummings said the team might do some temperature checks with jurisdictions and give them feedback regarding the issues on the charts.

Mr. Cummings said, previously, the PMT made the committee's recommendation on their behalf to the Executive Committee. He asked the committee to think about if they would like a representative to present their recommendation this time. He said this would avoid misinterpretation.

Mr. Cummings adjourned the meeting at 4:09 p.m.